

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Bertolini in view of Kubota.

Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 17 to 27 have been added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 to 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Bertolini in view of Kubota.

Bertolini shows a folding roll 11 with tuckers 12 and grippers 13'.

Kubota shows a folding blade passing through a covers.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 5, which recites that the first and second rotatable supports are rotatable with respect to each other so as to set a fold position of the signature.

Claim 1 now recites:

a plurality of gripping devices supported on a first rotatable support and including a first gripping device for holding a signature on the cylinder;

a plurality of tucking devices supported on a second rotatable support, the tucking devices including a first tucking device and a second tucking device, the first gripping device being located circumferentially between the first tucking device and second tucking device, the first and second rotatable supports being rotatable with respect to each other so as to set a fold position of the signature.

Bertolini does not show any second rotatable support for a plurality of tucking devices supported on a second rotatable support which rotates with respect to the gripping device support to set a fold position, as now recited in claim 1.

It is not clear what the office action is identifying in Bertolini as the second rotatable support, but claim 1 requires a single support supporting a plurality of tucking devices. Any such

support in Bertolini would not be rotatable with respect to the first support.

Also element 17 of Bertolini identified by the office action does not support "a plurality of gripping devices" but rather only a single gripping device.

Moreover, the fold position in Bertolini cannot be set, as tuckers and grippers are generally in a fixed position to each other with regard to the fold position. Any purported rotation of element 19 (and it is not clear that it rotates and any support therefore only supports a single element) is free-floating, and thus cannot be used to set a fold position as claimed in claim 1 (See Bertolini at col. 2, lines 25 to 56).

Kubota also does not show these features.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 and its amended claims is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claim 6, Bertolini does not appear to show two separate spider arms, nor is there any disclosure related thereto. In fact only one frame appears to be present.

New Claims

New claims 17 to 25 recite features also not shown in the prior art. Claim 17 for example recites that the rotatable supports rotate about a same axis. Support is found in the specification at page 5, lines 14 to 15.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

No fee is believed required. If any fee is required at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully Submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris